



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

In §7 both *superassent* and *superarint* are well attested by the Mss, but it would seem that *superassent* is more suitable, for the order of events (ideas) is (a) The Helvetians fought with the Germans, both in their own land and in the territory of the Germans, with general success; (b) The Helvetians have failed to prove a match for our army; (c) Those same Germans are now facing us, the Romans.

Now these three events took place in this order in time. For this reason, the pluperfect used in *superassent* would show a past antecedent to another past; and the perfect in *potuerint* would show an action preceding the action of the main verb *esse*, yet not so far back in time as the action of *superassent*. Any other combination of tenses would fail to give this meaning, or would leave the sense ambiguous.

Thus, *superarint* and *potuerint* would leave unmarked the difference in time between the two actions; *superassent* and *potuissent* (changed to observe tense-sequence) would likewise fail to show this difference; *superassent* (or *superarint*) and *possent* would fail to bring out the time-relation of *possent* (*potuerint*) and *esse*.

These considerations tell against the reading *superarint*, and explain why *potuerint* violates the rule of tense-sequence; the violation may be called an instance of Repraesentatio, but it is Repraesentatio for a very special reason.

(3) 1.40.12 Quod non fore dicto audientes neque signa laturi dicantur, nihil se ea re commoveri: scire enim, quibuscumque exercitus dicto audiens non fuerit, aut male re gesta fortunam defuisse aut aliquo facinore comperto avaritiam esse convictam.

This stands in the same long passage of indirect discourse as the preceding; it forms the second sentence containing primary subjunctives. But here there is a special reason for *fuerit*: only the perfect could here express, distinctly, an action preceding the time of speaking and yet subsequent to the time of *defuisse* and *esse convictam*. The pluperfect would have obscured the temporal relation with the infinitives; the imperfect would have failed to give the relation to the time of speaking. What Caesar desires to say is 'Disobedience on the part of soldiers has always been preceded by ill-luck or dishonesty on the part of the commander'. And this he says in the only way possible, if he is to avoid ambiguity.

Possibly the Repraesentatio in *dicantur* is induced by the tense of *fuerit*; but this is a less interesting clause.

(4) 1.40.14 Quod si praeterea nemo sequatur, tamen se cum sola decima legione iturum, de qua non dubitaret, sibi eam praetoriam cohortem futuram.

We have here the remaining instance of Repraesentatio in this troublesome chapter; for it there is again a special reason.

In relation to the time of speaking, *sequatur* represents a future idea, and *dubitaret* a present idea. The

rule of sequence of tenses would throw them both into the imperfect subjunctive; but by the use of Repraesentatio in *sequatur*, the time distinction is preserved.

These brief disquisitions upon the use of the tenses in a few miscellaneous passages in the first book of Caesar's Gallic War will tend to show, I trust, that the factors governing the choice of subjunctive tenses in subordinate clauses are of varied nature, and not to be expressed by a single rule, nor by two rules. When I say "two rules", I mean of course, first, the conventional rule for the sequence of tenses, by which the subordinate subjunctives signify by their tense only time relative to the time of the verb on which they depend; and second, Professor Hale's dictum (American Journal of Philology 7.465), that "in dependent as in independent subjunctives, the tense conveys meaning, and owes its choice to that fact".

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

ROLAND G. KENT.

## REVIEWS

Religious Cults Associated with the Amazons. By Florence Mary Bennett. New York: Columbia University Press (1912). Pp. 79. \$1.25 in cloth, \$1.00 in paper.

This Columbia dissertation contains five chapters: I The Amazons in Greek Legend (1-16); II The Great Mother (17-29); III Ephesian Artemis (30-39); IV Artemis Astrateia and Apollo Amazonius (40-56); V Ares (57-72). These are followed by a Conclusion (73-76) and a Bibliography (77-79). Formally, the center of gravity lies in the associated cults; actually, however, the interest of the reader, if not of the writer, is centered on the Amazons themselves. In other words, the reviewer gets the impression that the study was undertaken with a view to determine, if possible, by an investigation of the character of the cults with which they are in Greek tradition associated, the nature of the Amazons and the origin of the myths in which they figure.

The studies of the several cults with which the Amazons are connected are carefully conducted, the emphasis being properly placed on those aspects which appear to afford hope of throwing light on the Amazons. In the case of the Great Mother and of Ephesian Artemis, who present very complex phenomena, limitation was imperative. This very complexity, however, growing out of the fact that the divinities in question had come to unite practically all the functions which in other cases were distributed to specialized functionaries creates for the student great difficulties, since it affords opportunity for the association of a great variety of beings with them. Hence the association of the Amazons with them would be inconclusive, were it not for their intimate connection with the cults of Ares, Artemis Astrateia and Apollo Amazonius. Of course, their quality as warriors is of their essence, and

would sufficiently account for the legends which father them on Ares. In the last resort, then, it is their association with Artemis Astrateia and Apollo Amazonius which alone serves to determine their character. Unfortunately, here the evidence is scant; but Miss Bennett has made the most of it and eked it out with related data.

The chapter on the Amazons in Greek legend gives a good summary of the facts, which is more complete than any other with which I am acquainted; I have, however, noted several omissions. I will mention one, which I do not recall seeing noted in any treatment of the subject, because if the clue be followed it may possibly lead to interesting results. It occurs in a connection where scholars are not apt to be looking for mythology, in Hippocrates *Περὶ Ἀρθρων*, §3 4.232 h.): *μυθολογοῦσι δέ τινες, ὅτι αἱ Ἀμαζονίδες τὸ ἄρσεν γένος τὸ ἐωυτῶν αὐτίκα νήπιον ἐὼν ἐξαθρέουσιν, αἱ μὲν κατὰ τὰ γούνατα αἱ δὲ κατὰ τὰ ἰσχιά, ὥς δὴθεν χολὰ γίνοντο, καὶ μὴ ἐπιβουλεύει τὸ ἄρσεν γένος τῷ θήλει· χειρώναξιν ἄρα τουτέοισι χρέονται, ὅκῳσα ἡ σκυτεῖς ἔργα ἡ χαλκείης ἡ ἄλλο ὅ τι ἐδραῖον ἔργον. εἰ μὲν οὖν ἀληθεῖα ταῦτά ἐστιν, ἐγὼ μὲν οὐκ οἶδα κτλ.*

As to the conclusion at which the author arrives, it seems that we must accept it. The Amazons are to be regarded as the *θιασος* of a primitive matriarchal divinity of fertility and war, having orgiastic rites. Whether we can now distinguish between "Thracian-Phrygian" and "Hittite-Cappadocian" is doubtful, and, for the student of Greek mythology, perhaps immaterial.

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY,

W. A. HEIDEL.

Demosthenes on the Crown. Edited by Milton W. Humphreys. New York: American Book Company (1913). Pp. 306. \$1.25.

Professor Humphreys possesses in several respects marked qualifications for editing a great masterpiece like the Oration on the Crown. Since his first appearance before the philologists of the nation with a paper on Latin Iambic Trimeters, in 1876, he has been regarded as one of our best classical scholars. At the Washington meeting of The American Philological Association, 1906, the Managing Editor of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY referred to the series of papers of which this was the first—all an outgrowth of Humphreys's studies for his doctor's dissertation, *Quaestiones Metricae de Accentus Momento in Versu Heroico* (Leipzig, 1874)—as showing profounder scholarship than a paper on a similar theme by the English scholar, Professor H. A. J. Munro; and the well deserved compliment was greeted with ringing applause. At the Williamstown meeting of the Association (1894) the late Professor Seymour spoke to the writer of Professor Humphreys as one of the two most accurate American classical scholars. In short, since the beginning of the fourth quarter of the last century, no American scholar has doubted that Dr.

Humphreys knows Greek. Another special qualification for editing the De Corona is the fact that, as stated in the Preface, for more than a third of a century Dr. Humphreys has annually taught this oration. Hence he knows what helps are needful or useful for students; and he has made his book first of all for students. But it will be a very wise teacher who does not find that he himself also learns much, from the notes of this volume, about Greek usage. Compare e.g. the note on the use of *οὗτος* for 'the following', in §12; on *τις*, 'a sort of', in §18; on *κεκωλυκώς εἶην* in §22; on *καὶ γάρ* in §25; on *ἀλλὰ γάρ* in §42; on *πότεν* in §47, etc.

Another remark of the Preface is worth noting: "The examples, even those that are found in other editions, were for the most part collected by the editor". And it may be added that, for a college text-book, the number of illustrative examples will be found surprisingly large. Only long-continued study and use of the oration could have brought together a collection of examples so abundant and illuminating.

The Introduction treats, first, Demosthenes as an Orator (10 pages), under such rubrics as Training, Style, Eloquence. Under the head of Style are discussed (1) The Grammatical and Rhetorical Structure, (2) The Rhythmical Form, (3) Rhetorical Figures, (4) Other Devices. Then comes a discussion of History of the Suit (3 pages); and, finally, a section entitled Demosthenes and Aeschines (4 pages). There are three Appendices: (1) on Manuscripts (1 page), adapted from Goodwin; (2) Critical Notes (14 pages); (3) Historical Sketch (20 pages). The Greek Index covers 7 pages in double column, the English Index 4 pages. Both text and notes are unusually free from misprints, and the book is brought out in the publishers' best form.

I kept in mind the purpose of the book as I read the notes, and I went consecutively through the whole oration, reading the exegetical notes as I went, comparing Goodwin's editio minor step by step. The result was an enhanced appreciation of both works, and I felt often, as I read and compared, that English and American classical teachers are to be congratulated on having two such satisfactory editions to choose from for their classes. We surely owe thanks to public spirited publishers, for within the short space of nine years, when the study of Greek is languishing and students are few, there appear from two of our oldest and ripest Greek scholars editions of the greatest masterpiece of oratory, done with the scholar's best skill and with no sparing of expense and care on the part of the publishers. In the one case we have the last work from the hand of Professor Goodwin, the product of an *emeritus*; let us hope that from the leisure of Professor Humphreys, now also *emeritus*, we may look for still other like ripe fruit.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN. CHARLES FORSTER SMITH.